MINUTES BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF YORK

Regular Meeting March 5, 2002

7:00 p.m.

Meeting Convened. A Regular Meeting of the York County Board of Supervisors was called to order at 7:02 p.m., Tuesday, March 5, 2002, in the Board Room, York Hall, by Chairman Donald E. Wiggins.

<u>Attendance</u>. The following members of the Board of Supervisors were present: Walter C. Zaremba, Sheila S. Noll, Donald E. Wiggins, James S. Burgett, and Thomas G. Shepperd.

Also in attendance were James O. McReynolds, County Administrator; and James E. Barnett, County Attorney.

Invocation. Miss Tara Smiddy, York County Youth Commission, gave the Invocation.

<u>Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America</u>. Vice Chairman Zaremba led the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENTATIONS

YORK COUNTY YOUTH COMMISSION

Mr. Ryan Touhill, Chairman of the York County Youth Commission, made the Commission's third quarterly report to the Board of Supervisors. He reviewed for the Board the events the Commission had been involved in since December, including the Yorktown Christmas Tree Lighting Ceremony, an Adopt-A-Highway project, a County-wide ski trip at Wintergreen, a County-wide middle school dance, and the Senior Center Valentine Day Party. Upcoming events of the Commission include: the Zweibrücken Student Exchange Program, another Adopt-A-Highway project, and the Right Choices for Youth Program Forum. Mr. Touhill also welcomed Mr. Burgett back as the Commission's Board Liaison.

<u>Mrs. Noll</u> expressed interest in the Right Choices for Youth Program and asked Mr. Touhill to explain the program for the Board.

<u>Chairman Wiggins</u> expressed the Board's pride in the job the Youth Commissioners are doing for the County.

PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2003 OPERATING BUDGET

Mr. James O. McReynolds, County Administrator, presented to the Board of Supervisors the proposed FY2003 Budget, and he reviewed the General Fund budget issues impacting the budget which included:

No tax rate increase School funding Employee compensation State funding

He discussed projected General Fund revenues by source which indicates a \$5.2 million or 7.2 percent increase over FY2002, which can be attributed to growth in the property tax base. The population is expected to grow by about 1.3 with 60,400 people residing in York County in July of 2003. This lower population growth is the result of the steps taken by the Board to manage growth through changes in the zoning densities that will lower the County's ultimate population to approximately 80,000. A small increase in the student population is expected over the projected FY2002 figure, going from 11,810 to 11,960 in FY2003. During calendar year 2001, 554 new housing units were completed in the County, and construction is expected to continue at a slightly slower pace during 2002. Education is by far the largest single expenditure and

priority in the General Fund taking 46 percent of its total. The School Board was initially told it could expect an increase of \$1.7 million in the local contribution for education, but it was now being recommended that an additional \$170,000 be provided to support the School Division. Mr. McReynolds then reviewed the decline in state and federal funding and the increase in local funding for the school system over the past years. He then reviewed the 10.25 new positions being recommended as well as recommended compensation cost increases due to step adjustments and a 2.75 percent market adjustment. He briefly reviewed the non-personnel increases amounting to \$1,391,000, and noted he was also recommending that the contingency reserve be increased by \$224,000. In summary, Mr. McReynolds stated that over the past years, population growth, additional school and other programs, declining federal and state support, and program cost shifting have greatly raised the demand on County resources, although the proposed budget maintains tax rates at their current levels

Mr. Burgett asked if the 46 percent figure for the School Division included capital costs.

Mr. McReynolds indicated it included County funding for school operations and capital debt.

Mr. Zaremba asked what other organizations/agencies receive a large part of their budgets through the state as well as the County.

Mr. McReynolds cited the Colonial Services Board, the York-Poquoson Department of Social Services, the Health Department, and certain regional efforts such as the regional jail and the Merrimac Center.

<u>Mr. Zaremba</u> noted that because the General Assembly had not yet made its final decisions on the state budget, there was the possibility that these agencies might possibly be looking to the County to make up for any state shortfalls.

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> recommended that, if that were to happen, the Board only fund that which is mandated because the County would be required to fund that additional amount in the future.

<u>Mr. Zaremba</u> asked Mr. McReynolds to provide the Board with a tutorial on what is not mandated so that the Board can make those decisions in an informed manner.

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> indicated that by the Board's next work session the staff may not know the final outcome of the General Assembly and the Governor's actions with regard to the budget, but staff will keep the Board informed.

CITIZENS COMMENT PERIOD

Mr. and Mrs. Steve Dodson, 48 Main Street, Newport News, appeared to appeal to the Board of Supervisors to allow them to pay the originally offered water connection fee of \$2,850 for property they own at 411 Ilex Drive in Yorktown. They indicated Mrs. Dodson's mother had previously owned the property prior to going into a nursing home, and they purchased the property from her and did not know she had not acted on the County's letters that went out when the project was first advertised for the reduced fee.

Mr. Joseph Haggerty, 403 Timberline Loop, presented the Board with a petition containing the signatures of 84 percent of the current residents of Rainbrook Villas concerning a safety problem on Route 17 at Grafton Drive. He indicated the residents have to make a U-turn in order to enter Rainbrook, and he had been told there had already been one accident. Mr. Haggerty stated the petition asks the County to request VDOT to continue on its current schedule for the Burt's Road project which will help alleviate the subject safety problem.

COUNTY ATTORNEY REPORTS AND REQUESTS

Mr. Barnett reported on the status of the following legislation currently under consideration by the General Assembly:

House Bill 477

Requires mailing of notices to all property owners where density is affected. The Senate version requires notifica-

tion to all property owners immediately affected that would decrease dwelling unit density.

House Bill 1299

Would allow a replacement manufactured home, even though the original one was a non-conforming use, if the original is destroyed for any reason.

Mr. Barnett then indicated his office recently participated in a legal issues seminar sponsored by the Human Resources Division. Assistant County Attorney Carla Hook spoke on employee privacy, and Mr. Barnett spoke on sovereign immunity. He also noted that by the time of the next Regular Meeting, staff should have heard from the Justice Department on the County's redistricting application.

Mr. Zaremba indicated that back in November the Board submitted its legislative package to the County's representatives in the General Assembly. He asked if staff had heard any status reports on the Board's legislative requests.

<u>Mr. Barnett</u> stated the only one he knew about was the annexation legislation which passed both houses unanimously. He also noted that the photo-monitoring bill died an early death. He stated he would provide the Board with a final report on the County's legislative package at the next meeting.

<u>Chairman Wiggins</u> asked if anyone knew the status of the 1 percent tax increase bill for transportation and schools.

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> stated he had talked to Delegate Rapp this afternoon who stated the bill has gone to the Governor, but he has some questions. Based on Miss Rapp's comments, he stated the Governor planned on signing the bill in some form.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR REPORTS AND REQUESTS

Mr. McReynolds reminded the Board of its March 12 work session on the proposed FY03 budget. He stated staff would present to the Board more documentation on the proposed budget to help the Board members prepare for their deliberations. He asked the Board members to provide staff at that time with the budget areas or topics they wish staff to cover during the following work sessions. Mr. McReynolds noted that the public hearings on the proposed budget and tax rates would be held on March 14 at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Room of York Hall.

MATTERS PRESENTED BY THE BOARD

<u>Mr. Shepperd</u> reminded the citizens of District 5 about his town meeting to be held at Tabb Elementary School on March 7. He stated staff has helped him prepare some very short presentations on several topics, and there will be a period for discussion on each item. There will also be a very interesting series of slides reflecting reports of the Sheriff's Department.

Meeting Recessed. At 7:52 p.m. Chairman Wiggins declared a short recess.

<u>Meeting Reconvened</u>. At 8:01 p.m. the meeting was reconvened in open session by order of the Chair.

PUBLIC HEARING

SALE OF BETHEL TOWN HALL PROPERTY

Mr. McReynolds made a presentation on proposed Resolution R02-40 to authorize the execution of an agreement for the sale of County property located at 1606 Yorktown Road, known as Bethel Town Hall. He noted the property had been surplus for an extended period, and both adjacent property owners were contacted to determine if either one wished to acquire the property. One of the adjacent property owners wishes to purchase the property to incorporate it into his existing parcel, and staff recommends selling the property for \$15,000 which would be

the increased assessed value of the purchaser's property with the additional property. He noted that standing alone the property was a non-conforming lot that was much smaller in relation to required minimum 1-acre lot sizes in the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Burgett asked where the contract was and who set the sales price discounting the property by 40 percent. He stated it is a saleable lot and should not be discounted.

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> indicated staff would make the contract available to the Board. With regard to the assessment, he noted that until the Board votes on the sale of the property, no price reduction has taken place with regard to the assessment. He stated the staff's logic for recommending a lower-than-assessed value sales price is based on the fact that if this property were combined with the purchaser's, it would no longer be a separate buildable lot, and the assessment on the combined lots has a less worth. If the lot remains as it, then the assessment would remain at \$24,900.

Mr. Burgett asked why the staff did not advertise the proposed sale to the public, giving everyone an opportunity.

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> stated that in this particular instance staff felt it was more advantageous to combine the non-conforming parcel, which had a number of drawbacks, with one of the adjacent properties. He stated that normally the staff would advertise the sale of surplus property publicly.

<u>Mr. Burgett</u> questioned if this was going to be staff's normal procedure in the future for selling County real estate. He stated he did not recall seeing any proposal for the sale of the subject property.

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> stated he would not typically recommend this procedure for other properties that do not have the same constraints as the subject property.

<u>Mr. Burgett</u> stated he felt this matter was brought to the Board after the fact, and he would like to know of these matters before the fact in the future. He stated these types of matters are generally discussed in Closed Meeting. He then asked why the County was not properly maintaining the building that is situated on the subject property.

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> indicated the staff has been maintaining the building, although at a minimal level since it is not being used.

Mrs. Noll asked if the building would remain on the property if the property were purchased by the adjacent property owner.

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> stated it was his understanding that it would remain on the property to be used for storage or a guest house.

<u>Mrs. Noll</u> indicated she would feel more comfortable if the agreement could be structured so that the purchaser could not use the building for an accessory apartment. She acknowledged that this was tax-free property, and selling it would put it back on the tax rolls.

Mr. McReynolds stated the owner would have to get a use permit approved by the Board of Supervisors in order to use the building as a guest house.

Mr. Shepperd asked if there were any numbers on how much parking space the property could have.

Mr. McReynolds stated staff had not had an opportunity to look into that aspect.

<u>Mr. Shepperd</u> stated he felt Mr. Burgett had a lot of good points on the sale of the property, as well as Mrs. Noll's comments on what could be done with the building. He indicated the building needs some paint, and it could be used, although there is probably a parking problem. It will cost the County some money for maintenance, but he stated he is opposed to selling any County property unless there is a very compelling reason.

Mr. Zaremba asked Mr. McReynolds what he meant when he said the property was non-conforming.

<u>Mr. McReynolds</u> stated the Rural Residential zoning requires a minimum lot size of one acre if water and sewer are available, and they are. This parcel is less than .2 acre.

<u>Mr. Zaremba</u> stated that with the County's ownership of the property there is no change of anyone building a home. If the County sells the property to the adjacent landowner, the adjacent landowner has agreed to remove the lot lines between the properties making one parcel. He asked what would be the opportunity in the future for the landowner to ask for a variance to build something on the property.

Mr. McReynolds stated the property owner could go to the Board of Zoning/Subdivision Appeals and ask for a variance at any point in time.

Mr. J. Mark Carter, Planning and Zoning Manager, stated the two properties together would not be wide enough to re-subdivide, but the owner could always ask for a variance.

Discussion followed on the possibility of the use of a flag lot and the cost of maintenance on the 700 square foot building currently located on the subject property.

<u>Chairman Wiggins</u> stated he would not like to see the property sold as a separate lot because he feels a judge would allow a house to be built on it. He stated it was not going to be of any use to the County, and he did not want to see a non-conforming house being built on the property.

<u>Chairman Wiggins</u> then called to order a public hearing on proposed Resolution R02-40 which was duly advertised as required by law and is entitled:

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT FOR THE SALE OF CERTAIN REAL ESTATE OWNED BY THE COUNTY LOCATED AT 1606 YORKTOWN ROAD

There being no one present who wished to speak concerning the subject resolution, <u>Chairman Wiggins</u> closed the public hearing.

<u>Mr. Burgett</u> stated there are numerous planned subdivisions in York County where the lots are even smaller than .2 acres. He indicated there is constant talk about the availability of housing for young people in York County, and this would be a wonderful lot for a starter home for a young family. Mr. Burgett stated the Board should try to maximize this one little nonconforming lot by selling it to someone who could do something with it. He stated he feels strongly about not discounting this property, and he asked the Board to defeat the resolution.

<u>Mrs. Noll</u> suggested that the Board table this matter and advertise the property for sale to the public for a limited length of time. If the property does not sell, then the alternative could be to allow staff to continue the contract with the adjacent property owner for the sale.

<u>Mr. Burgett</u> indicated he felt Mrs. Noll's suggestion was fair and that a month would be a reasonable period of time.

<u>Chairman Wiggins</u> stated he felt as strongly as Mr. Burgett but in the opposite direction. He stated he did not feel the County should sell a .2-acre parcel with a 700 square foot building as a lot that a house could be put on in a district that has a minimum of 1-acre lots. He stated he would rather see the County keep the property.

<u>Mr. Shepperd</u> stated he did not want the County to sell the property at all. He stated if the building on the property is a problem to maintain, it could be torn down. He suggested that in the future the property might be used for some public purpose.

<u>Mr. Zaremba</u> stated he did not feel the Board was ready to make a decision on whether or not to sell this property, and more staff work was needed. He then moved that the Board table consideration of proposed Resolution R02-40.

On roll call, the vote was:

Yea: (5) Zaremba, Noll, Burgett, Shepperd, Wiggins

Nay: (0)

MATTERS PRESENTED BY THE BOARD (Continued)

Mr. Burgett commended the York County Youth Commission for the work it is doing and for its involvement in certain activities. He noted that five of the Commissioners participated in a Model United Nations Day, and all of them received awards, with James Noel taking "Best Delegate." Mr. Burgett stated he would be the Honorary Chairman for the Right Choices for Youth program, and he reminded everyone that Friday was the deadline for submitting nominations for the Outstanding Youth of the Year Awards program. He then stated he would like the County to start an initiative for Route 17 beautification with the citizens and businesses. He spoke of the many derelict buildings and areas along Route 17 that are eyesores, stating he was interested in getting the citizens and business owners together to determine how something can be done to spruce up Route 17. He stated he felt it would be a worthy project for the community.

Mrs. Noll spoke about the synchronization of traffic lights on Route 17, commending VDOT for the recent work done on them. She also spoke about the need for transportation projects in the Hampton Roads region in order for the region to thrive in the future. She stated Senator Marty Williams should be given a great deal of credit for having the courage to propose the legislation for the transportation referendum. She indicated a lot of study has gone into the six proposed transportation projects over the past five years, and they are crucial for the region's tourism industry.

Mr. Zaremba spoke of the Neighborhoods Conference that took place two weeks ago at Lafayette High School in James City County. He stated it was the sixth time the conference was held, and it brought together citizens to learn about the many component parts that make up the three participating localities. He stated the conference was well attended, and he asked everyone to put it on their calendars for next year. Mr. Zaremba then addressed this year's legislative process, and he suggested that there be some follow-up done to close the loop on the 12 specific legislative requests the Board submitted to the General Assembly. He stated the Board needs to get with the County's delegation to talk about what the Board and County staff can do better next year. Mr. Zaremba also suggested that the Board do the same thing in looking at the budget process to determine how to improve that process for next year. He spoke about the potential shortfalls coming from Richmond and how the Board would deal with them.

Chairman Wiggins noted there was a lot of controversy about Williamsburg Community Hospital moving to York County, and the press has insinuated there is a lot of animosity between York County and Williamsburg over this issue. He noted he had lunch with Williamsburg's Mayor Zeidler, and although she is not happy about the move, she and the city hold no animosity. He stated York County had the property that the hospital wanted. Chairman Wiggins then spoke of the informational hearing VDOT held at York High School on the Route 17 widening project, stating the people who go to these public meetings expect to be able to be heard and feel that their comments will be taken into consideration. He stated this wasn't the case, that the project had already been approved and would be moving forward, and he did not see a need to hold these meetings. He noted that there would be another such meeting on the extension of Fort Eustis Boulevard into Seaford the next night. A great deal of the engineering work has been done on the project, and the project will go forward.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. Shepperd asked that Item Nos. 3 and 4 be removed from the Consent Calendar.

Mr. Burgett moved that the Consent Calendar be approved as amended, Item Nos. 2 and 5, respectively.

On roll call the vote was:

Yea: (5) Noll, Burgett, Shepperd, Zaremba, Wiggins

Nay: (0)

March 5, 2002

Thereupon, the following minutes were approved and resolutions adopted:

Item No. 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The following minutes of the York County Board of Supervisors were approved:

February 5, 2002, Regular Meeting February 12, 2002, Adjourned Meeting

Item No. 5. REIMBURSEMENT FOR FINANCIAL LOSS: Resolution R02-41.

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE REIMBURSEMENT OF FINANCIAL LOSS DUE TO KILLING OF LIVESTOCK OR POULTRY BY DOGS

WHEREAS, York County maintains in Fund 10 - GENERAL FUND monies appropriated for the reimbursement of persons suffering financial loss because of the killing of livestock or poultry by dogs; and

WHEREAS, John Combs certified that he has sustained the loss of four chickens by dogs owned by person(s) unknown, and has claimed a total of \$27.80, which is reimbursable pursuant to the requirements of Section 3.1-796.118, Code of Virginia;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Board of Supervisors this the 5^{th} day of March, 2002, that the County Administrator be and he hereby is authorized to reimburse Mr. Combs in the amount of \$27.80 for his claim pursuant to Section 3.1-796.118, Code of Virginia.

<u>Item No. 3. PURCHASE AUTHORIZATION: Proposed Resolution R02-43</u> (Removed from Consent Calendar)

Mr. Shepperd asked if the cost of the third year of the landscaping contract had gone up.

<u>Mr. Carter</u> indicated the cost for the third year was the same as the first and second. He addressed the investment the County has in the plantings, and stated the funds were for maintenance on the plants.

Mr. Shepperd asked if the County does the mowing.

<u>Mr. Carter</u> stated the Regional Jail inmates mow the Route 17 corridor as much as possible, but it depends on their availability.

Mr. Zaremba asked what last year's audit contract price was.

Mr. McReynolds stated he thought it was about 3 percent less than this year's price.

Mrs. Marycarol White, Director of Financial and Management Services, indicated that last year's contract was approximately \$47,250.

Mr. Zaremba asked if the landscaping contract had a watering provision.

Mr. Carter indicated it did.

Mr. Shepperd then moved the adoption of proposed Resolution R02-43 that reads:

A RESOLUTION TO RENEW THE AUDIT SERVICES CONTRACT FOR A SECOND YEAR, AND TO RENEW THE LANDSCAPING SERVICES CONTRACT FOR A THIRD YEAR

WHEREAS, it is the policy of the Board of Supervisors that all procurements of goods and services by the County involving the expenditure of \$30,000 or more be submitted to the Board for its review and approval; and

WHEREAS, the County Administrator has determined that the following procurements are necessary and desirable, that they involve the expenditure of \$30,000 or more, and that all applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations have been complied with;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Board of Supervisors this the 5^{th} day of March, 2002, that the County Administrator be, and hereby is, authorized to execute procurement arrangements for the following two procurements:

Audit Services (Renewal) Landscaping Services (Renewal) AMOUNT \$ 49,150 34,800

On roll call, the vote was:

Yea: (5) Burgett, Shepperd, Zaremba, Noll, Wiggins

Nay: (0)

Item No. 4. TELEPHONIC AUTOMATED INSPECTION REQUEST AND PLAN REVIEW INFOR-MATION SYSTEM: Proposed Resolution R02-52 (Removed from Consent Calendar)

Mr. Shepperd asked why the staff was surprised by the need for this procurement.

Mr. John Hudgins, Director of Environmental and Development Services, stated the County had a software vendor who decided not to support the software any more and go out of business with that particular product. Staff had no anticipation of this action at this time and was surprised by the notice.

Mr. Shepperd asked how long it will take to get a new system in place.

Mr. Hudgins stated staff will have the critical elements in place this month.

Discussion followed regarding future vendor agreements containing clauses to provide the County with more notice before an agreement termination can take place. The Board also discussed staff providing a more thorough review when selecting a new vendor.

Mr. Shepperd then moved the adoption of proposed Resolution R02-52 that reads:

A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE EXECUTION OF TWO CONTRACTS WITH FRANKS SOLUTIONS, INC. FOR THE REPLACEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES AUTOMATED INSPECTION REQUEST AND PLAN REVIEW INFORMATION SYSTEM AND TO PURCHASE WEB INTEGRATION SOFTWARE

WHEREAS, it is the policy of the Board of Supervisors that all procurements of goods and services by the County involving the expenditure of \$30,000 or more be submitted to the Board for its review and approval; and

WHEREAS, the County Administrator has determined that the following procurement is necessary and desirable, that it involves the expenditure of \$30,000 or more, and that all applicable laws, ordinances, and regulations have been complied with;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Board of Supervisors this the 5th day of March, 2002, that the County Administrator be, and hereby is, authorized to conclude procurement arrangements with Frank Solutions, Inc., for the replacement of the Automated Inspection Request and Plan Review Information System.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Administrator be, and hereby is, authorized to conclude procurement arrangements with Franks Solutions, Inc., effective July 1, 2002, for Web Interface Software.

AMOUNT \$ 65,260 March 5, 2002

Information System Replacement

Web Interface Software

On roll call, the vote was:

Yea: (5) Shepperd, Zaremba, Noll, Burgett, Wiggins

Nay: (0)

NEW BUSINESS

MINOR MODIFICATION—APPLICATION NO. UP-573-01, STOR MOORE FACILITY, WOLFTRAP ROAD

\$31,200

The request for a minor modification to the special use permit approval granted by Resolution R01-65(R) for a mini-warehouse facility located on the south side of Wolftrap Road was removed from the agenda at the request of the applicant.

<u>CLOSED MEETING</u>. At 9:12 p.m. <u>Mr. Zaremba</u> moved that the meeting be convened in Closed Meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(a)(3) of the Code of Virginia pertaining to the acquisition of real property for a public purpose.

On roll call the vote was:

Yea: (5) Zaremba, Noll, Burgett, Shepperd, Wiggins

Nay: (0)

<u>Meeting Reconvened</u>. At 9:27 p.m. the meeting was reconvened in open session by order of the Chair.

Mrs. Noll moved the adoption of proposed Resolution SR-1 that reads:

A RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY COMPLIANCE WITH THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REGARDING MEETING IN CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the York County Board of Supervisors has convened a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3711.1 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the York County Board of Supervisors that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Board of Supervisors this the 5th day of March, 2002, hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered by the York County Board of Supervisors.

On roll call the vote was:

Yea: (5) Noll, Burgett, Shepperd, Zaremba, Wiggins

Nay: (0)

A brief discussion ensued concerning the County's involvement in the Historical Committee's museum and the 4^{th} of July Celebration.

 $\underline{\text{Meeting Adjourned}}$. At 9:40 p.m. $\underline{\text{Mr. Burgett}}$ moved that the meeting be adjourned to 6:00 p.m., Tuesday, March 12, 2002, in the East Room, York Hall, for the purpose of conducting a work session.

On roll call the vote was:

Yea: (5) Burgett, Shepperd, Zaremba, Noll, Wiggins

Nay: (0)

James O. McReynolds, Clerk York County Board of Supervisors Donald E. Wiggins, Chairman York County Board of Supervisors